

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PAUL R. ZINDA, III,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMADOR COUNTY SHERIFF
DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:22-cv-01990-KJM-JDP (PC)

ORDER

Plaintiff, a former county inmate proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On January 9, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on all parties, and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. Neither party has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.


The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) (“[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court

1 . . .”). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be
2 supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 4 1. The findings and recommendations filed January 9, 2024, ECF No. 28, are adopted in
5 full;
6 2. This action is dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to
7 comply with court orders for the reasons set forth in the November 21, 2023 order;
8 3. Defendant’s motion to dismiss, ECF No. 24, is denied as moot; and
9 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case.

10 DATED: April 3, 2024.

11 
12 _____
13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28